DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 074 UD 026 305

AUTHOR Lynch, James
TITLE Pedagogical Strategies To Reduce Prejudice: Towards Middle Range Theories.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Awareness; Cultural Interrelationships; *Cultural Pluralism; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; Foreign Countries; *Holistic Approach; Integrated Activities; Minority Groups; Minority Group Teachers; *Multicultural Education; Racial Attitudes; *Racial Bias; Stereotypes; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Educational policies to combat racist attitudes can succeed if comprehensive strategies are developed compatible with the context and the skills of the teachers involved. These strategies should be part of broader social policies and interests. Strategies should be holistic, comprehensive in scope and sequence, and involve the total school environment. Maximum use should be made of the resources and skills of the local community. Teaching strategies for prejudice reduction should include cognitive objectives to correct misinformation, as well as affective and behavioral objectives. Positive values are likely to transfer from one issue to another, but systematic reinforcement is necessary if gains are to be persistent. The purposes, values, and attributes of multiculturalism should permeate the school's functioning, including the following: (1) a democratic classroom and school ethos; (2) ethnic pluralism reflected in staff composition; (3) positive multi-ethnic interactions with significant others; (4) instruction that accounts for culturally different learning styles; and (5) mutual and multiple acculturation of student and teacher. Teaching and learning activities should include development of decision making and social action. Particular attention must be given to assessment and evaluation. A list of references is included. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297074

8-4-88

PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES TO REDUCE PREJUDICE: TOWARDS MIDDLE RANGE THEORIES

by

Professor James Lynch

Dean of the Faculty of Education,

Sunderland Polytechnic, United Kingdom.

Presented at the AREA Annual Conference

New Orleans

April 1988

UD026305

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James Lynch
Sunderland Polytechnic

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

English education is currently convulsed by discussions surrounding proposed government legislation for the introduction of a national curriculum and the testing of children at age seven, eleven, fourteen and sixteen. Against this background and assailed from left, right and centre, multicultural education is in full retreat and anti-racist education has been off-sided by astute political stage management and the blatant excesses of word or deed of some of its adherents. In the 'mainstream', the concepts of quality, value for money, accountability and economic relevance are the major value determinants of the current educational debate and it is increased standards and excellence not equity and absence of discrimination which are seen as the major goals for schools and teachers.

In this context, the issue of whether and how schools and teachers may undertake the task of systematically and rationally teaching for prejudice reduction and elimination, is difficult to legitimate in an educational agenda crowded with other 'richer' pickings. Racism awareness training (RAT) as introduced in isolated cases in the United Kingdom has been weak on both empirical and conceptual research and, in most cases, it has not been systematically evaluated and replicated and is ignorant or neglectful of the work of those seeking to achieve similar objectives elsewhere. In the isolated and discontinuous style which has tended to typify British efforts in this field, the vast potential of the literature from other countries has been largely neglected in favour of more primitive and less well-grounded approaches. Often such initiatives as have taken place, have been rough-shod neo-Marxist, and simplified neo-colonialist approaches have predominated, often advocating politicized intervention (Troyna, 1987): hortatory, polemical and manifestly inattentive to democratic values. The upshot has been an almost total disregard of the school's role in combatting prejudice and discrimination, or, on the other hand, short-term, spasmodic attempts at tackling particular prejudices in isolation and by methods which have been, at best uninformed, at worst educationally dubious attempts at indoctrination.

A further problem has been the failure of those, who have been concerned to introduce pedagogical strategies for prejudice reduction, to make common cause with other curriculum innovators in fields such as human rights, world studies, global education and environmental education, in a way which would make the issues, concepts, materials and objectives palatable to the educational establishment, let alone the public at large, and digestible by the existing curriculum. Indeed, quite the reverse has occurred with advocates of anti-racist multicultural education embracing competition, conflict and exclusivity rather than co-operation or collaboration. As a result of this 'autonomous' approach, educational policy-makers, researchers and theorists have treated such variables as gender, class and race independently rather than interactively and comprehensively, a

phenomenon which is of course not restricted to the United Kingdom (Grant and Sleeter, 1987).

Yet, culturally diverse societies inevitably and continually generate inter-personal and intergroup prejudices, located around descriptors such as birth, gender, race, ethnicity, creed, language etc. which, unchecked, lead to personal bigotry, social hostility, ethnic discrimination and even physical violence. Such societies involve a plethora of differing socialisation and enculturation processes in the primary agencies of the family and immediate community, which are automatically generative of predispositions to think, believe and act, not least to judge and evaluate, in ways which sharply diverge from, are often antagonistic to those of other groups, and are, in some cases, inimical to the values and norms of a pluralist democracy. Many children, thus, commence school with unhealthy prejudices which, unless 'evened out', or replaced by the school, are reinforced by the wider society, not least by the media, and, in turn, influence the ambience of the school, its culture and the educational opportunity of many children. In Britain, schools have traditionally sought to remain 'neutral', in fact tacitly sanctioning the beliefs and behaviours which are hostile to, and sometimes destructive of, the moral bases of a humane, democratic society which values human rights, freedom from irrational discrimination and a pluralism of legitimate cultures (Lynch, 1987a). The effect has been overall to reinforce ethnic captivity and deeply structurally embedded prejudice. The corollary of that deficit has been, that racism is not accepted as an explicator of the problems of victimized groups, and progress in formulating and legitimating more coherent and effective strategies and middle-range theories for education, as in the broader society, on the basis of multifactor explanations is stalled, while multicultural rhetoriticians continue to have a field day.

Multicultural education in the United Kingdom, has consistently failed to take on board this important universal function for schools in culturally diverse societies, of prejudice reduction, preferring instead to aim for soft targets such as folkloric content in the curriculum, the asserted need of some minority groups for improved self-images, or the indisputable need for major political reforms in the broader society. Such goals are, of course, highly laudible and desirable components of an overall approach to multicultural education, but they are far from being the whole story. They are, in other words, necessary but not sufficient, for they need to be integrated as part of a coherent and holistic commitment addressing both the special needs of some children and the common needs of all. For example, it is surely evident that insofar as and for as long as policies to combat prejudice are focussed on the special needs of black pupils alone, they are unlikely to radically alter or improve the racist attitudes, present and active amongst the majority population, not least in socially dominant

groups, whose status is secured by birth not ability; by tradition not worth; and by privilege not equality. Nor has the naive assumption that by confronting elite groups within society with their own prejudice, this would somehow cause them to lay down their 'high cards', proved an accurate prognostication.

For this reason, I want to argue that simplistic and unicausal explanations of differential educational attainment should be discarded, and that, accepting the role that racism plays in influencing the life-chances of visible minorities (and sexism and credism in marring the life-chances of those and other groups as well), schools need to take on board the explicit task if teaching to correct for prejudiced attitudes and beliefs. My argument is that schools can and do make a difference (Mortimore, 1988). I want to ask the question, how multicultural education may build on what already exists and support the development of deliberate, systematic learning strategies and a school ethos deriving from appropriate middle-range theories, so as to reduce, and if possible eradicate, undesirable social attitudes and behaviour. On the basis of our admittedly limited knowledge of how to correct for prejudice, I want to indicate the nodal points for guidance and support for teachers from outline theories of the middle-range to enable them to extend the criteria by which they judge their professional effectiveness, so as to include prejudice reduction as a major goal of their professional endeavours, at the same time as meeting the academic and intellectual goals, increasingly demanded of them. Such a commitment naturally implies that schools and teachers are able to make professional judgements on the basis of rational criteria about what is right and what is wrong in a multicultural society and school, accepting the essentially moral nature of a teacher's professional role, and the need for the criteria underlying their decisions to be subject to discourse, involving all legitimate cultural groups, and their strategies to appeal to the judgement of the learners. In other words, with all the imperfections inherent in the policy and practice of those words, the assumption is that schools can and do make a difference to life chances and that, in democratic societies, that difference has to be achieved by rational persuasion, teaching and argument, fully compatible with democratic values and educational not propagandist purposes.

I have already set out what I mean by prejudice, arguing that, in its literal sense, prejudice is the holding of a belief or opinion without adequate rational grounds or contrary to rational evidence to the contrary (Lynch, 1987a). As Bethlehem (1985) points out, such prejudice may focus on persons or things; it may be positive or begative in a formal sense. It is not <u>a priori</u> a hostile or negative opinion of belief, for we may be prejudiced <u>for</u> a person or thing as well as <u>against</u> them. Moreover, in this sense we all have prejudices. So the question arises of which prejudices, in democratic, culturally pluralist societies, must

be addressed by teachers in schools, how and when. There are no simple straightforward answers to this question; least of all in the ranks of traditional grand theories; and the same stricture applies to corrective action consistent with democratic principles.

As teachers, we expect children to make discriminations, ranging from placing objects into sets and categorizing them, to differentiating between discriminable stimuli and alternative good and bad behaviour. We do not expect them to categorize phenomena as identical, where rational grounds exist for discrimination. We also expect them to be able to learn how to generalize from specific evidence, interpreting accurately and fairly. Educators aim to enable children to achieve the rational bases, information, techniques, values and strategies, which will make it possible for them to categorize and generalize correctly on the basis of rational evidence and procedures. At the same time, students are expected to avoid stereotypical representations and prejudiced beliefs and to resist invitations to prejudiced attitudes and behaviour, deriving from irrational unjust or otherwise inappropriate criteria, for example, labels attached to such qualities as ethnic origin, race, sex, class and creed. Educators, thus encourage children to make some legitimate generalizations and discriminations, whilst avoiding and resisting others, for which there is no rational evidence or which contradict the basic ethics of a multicultural democracy (Lynch, 1987b).

The moral function of education (I do not mean religious), dictates that those prejudices, which offend against the ethical bases of a multicultural society and infringe human rights and dignity, have to be 'cooled out' by schools, for these are the ones which are inimical to the very fabric of that society. The school cannot remain neutral, and the imperative for the school to act is accentuated when the preconceived and stereotypical representation of a particular group or individual may motivate actions and behaviour which may visit on them inequality, injustice or even violence. Thus, as I have argued elsewhere (Lynch, 1987a), educators and schools are necessarily involved in a culturally diverse society in the rational and moral task of educating children out of negative attitudes and behaviour and of initiating them into morally acceptable attitudes and behaviour, congruent with the basic ethic of a multicultural society and its commitment to human rights and liberties. Such a task is both complex and demanding and it necessitates a continual and coherent reinforcement throughout the school life of the child and the extension of the currently existing skills and expertise of many teachers.

There are, of course, problems with the 'base' of my argument, as also with moving to the less speculative higher ground of middle-range theory-building. Firstly, far from combatting stereotypes and prejudices, education, colluding with other

agencies such as the media, seems often to propagate and reinforce them, whether in the field of gender, ethnic pride, racial derivation, or, particularly in the United Kingdom, with regard to social status, linguistic register, etc. Indeed, when the Public School/Oxbridge axis is considered, social class stratification and religious categorization and hierarchization can be seen as fundamental to the very social organisation, political structure and educational system of the United Kingdom. Secondly, in an era of increasing instrumental regulation of human behaviour in western societies, as opposed to the former theological bases, it is difficult, but by no means impossible, to achieve agreement on the basic ethic of a multicultural society, which, in turn, would enable us to identify which prejudices to counter and the reasons why. Is education for national pride a source of prejudice against other ethnic groups? Can religious education foster intergroup bigotry, rivalry, hostility and even violence? We would all recognise that the answer to these two questions can be a positive one, not least at times of dynamic externals on a society such as happened in the United Kingdom during the Falklands War.

Certainly, if prejudices are to be overcome, which are destructive of the very fabric of society, major legal and political changes are needed, for education can only solve educational problems. In such a co-ordinated initiative, however, the schools and individual teachers do have an important role to play, for they are the ones who daily have to make decisions about what constitutes moral behaviour in a multicultural society. Whilst not unproblematic, the decision about what prejudice to tackle in schools, how and when, derives directly from what is good and bad, acceptable and unacceptable, positive and negative in a multicultural society (Lynch, 1983; 1986; 1987a).

There are, of course, many ways in which teachers may show their commitment to prejudice reduction and elimination, but most importantly they may demonstrate it in their everyday lives and teaching. Schools, too, may show their commitment to prejudice reduction by developing a democratic ethos, striving to deliver equity for all pupils and to structure their work on the basis of democratic values such as human justice, freedom and dignity. Both schools and teachers need to empower their pupils to actively pursue democratic values and to combat prejudice. But, in order to do so, teachers and schools themselves have to be empowered, not with well-worn technocratic mechanisms for the solution of 'hand-me-down' problems, but towards a new critical intellectual relationship with their communities, with society and with the ends of education in a democratic society, which really appreciates cultural diversity through the way that it structures its discourse. As Aronowitz and Giroux have argued (1985a; 1985b), the role of the teacher needs to become that of the transformative intellectual, involved in the critical political discourse about ends as well as means in the pursuit

of more just social relations and a more equitable society, which excludes current prejudices such as racism, sexism, credism and classism.

The problem with that formulation, however, is that as legitimation crises in the broader society have accentuated, schools and teachers have increasingly been allocated the role of petty functionaries by dominant groups and governments as a technical arm of minor state apparatuses. Such a relegation has implied an almost exclusive concern with technical means rather than the changing ends of education and an increasing unwillingness to recognise that teachers are part of the power political structure and work in the context of circumambient economic and ideological conditions. They are thus part of, not apart from, the overall discourse concerning legitimate ends for a culturally diverse society which implements as well as declares democratic values. Schools and teachers are thus neither totally dominated by the social system nor totally autonomous from it but participants in an arena for discourse about educational ends, as well as means.

I consider the kinds of strategies which may be adopted by schools to achieve attitudes and behaviour that do not motivate to negatively discriminate on the basis of race, sex, ethnic origins and creed, to focus quite sharply on that which multicultural education is ultimately concerned with, ie morally acceptable behaviour. The task of education is to provide for the making of individual and group, rational judgements to support that morally acceptable behaviour. To achieve that goal, education has to tackle the motivators of discriminatory behaviour by concentrating on the criteria for what is rationally justifiable, acceptable behaviour within our society. Here, there are contrary views, with some arguing that, if the behaviour is changed, the beliefs will also change. Others assert that the values and attitudes have to be changed so that behaviour will follow. To my mind, teaching for both goals interactively is also tenable and can be effective, provided that cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions are taken into account. But how? Let me refer briefly to a small sample of the exemplary pedagogical work which has attempted to address that task and let us see if it is possible to draw out some guiding principles to construct some first bases for a theory of the middle range.

Most of the work in the field of prejudice reduction has been conducted in the United States over the past half century. There is, however, a small amount of indicative pioneer work in the United Kingdom, as well as some from other countries (Kehoe, 1984a, 1984b, 1984c). The work of Stenhouse in the early 1970s, for example, will be well known to many participants in this Conference. It remains unique in the United Kingdom in its innovatory contribution to the development of education, aimed at enhancing the rational judgement of those

being educated. Stenhouse (1984) sets out what he calls a series of 'researcher's speculations', and I have summarised (paraphrased and re-written) some of these (Items 1 - 7) as offering a direct contribution to practical initiatives which need to be borne in mind in the development of strategies for prejudice reduction (Lynch, 1986).

I am not suggesting that each of the exemplary statements is precisely as formulated by Stenhouse. Rather I am arguing, that provisional guiding principles may be derived from his work, and linked logically and interactively with principles, deriving from the work of other scholars and educators in the United Kingdom and abroad, thus commencing construction of a tenable theory of multicultural education. Such a theory can provide tenable bases for action on how to tackle prejudice and to correct for racism, sexism, classism and credism.

If we look at the work of Jeffcoate (1979, 1984), we can find a series of cognitive and affective objectives for a multicultural and multiracial curriculum, which might be able to address issues of prejudice reduction. As his work has been amended Cohen and Manion (1983) and Lynch (1986), it includes not only cognitive skills (it is important for cognitive knowledge to be acquired in order to correct for misinformation), but it also embraces affective attitudes, values and emotional sets. This is an important contribution to the construction of our theory of prejudice reduction (Item 8), because it implies a recognition that prejudice comprises emotionality and emotional dimensions as well as cognitive ones, and that any curriculum, to be effective, must include both. Of course, there is also a conative or behavioural dimension, which equally is often neglected.

Walkling (1980) raises basic ethical issues concerning the principles for the selection of the content of a multicultural curriculum which are of direct assistance to us in making decisions about teaching/learning strategies to correct for prejudice. He addresses the problem of how fair and just decisions about what should be included in the curriculum may be made, the procedures that might be involved and the kinds of purposes which might be addressed. Drawing up a series of continua between tolerance and selection in the case of content; relativism and absolutism in the case of procedures; and, transition and transformation in the case of purposes, he constructs a typology which identifies the complexity of decisions involved, but also calrifies the decisions which have to be made. Using his terms, decisions about prejudice reduction are likely to address transformational goals, on the basis of a selection from the overall culture of the nation state, including minority cultures, but not embracing the totality, and to tend to relativism in the procedures to be adopted. Thus, we may say that educational strategies for prejudice reduction must recognise certain fundamental principles, such as discourse, including all legitimate

cultural interests. Schools, being part of the structure of the nation state, will also need to adopt democratic practice in their structure and in their teaching. A democratic school and classroom atmosphere is thus a further necessity for educational strategies to correct for prejudiced attitudes (Item 9).

If we turn across the Atlantic to the work of Banks in the United States, we find a commitment to holistic strategies as the basis for prejudice reduction. Banks calls for the permeation of the whole school environment, its purposes, values and ethos, by means of measures which are comprehensive in scope and sequence. He envisages a process of cultural reciprocity between teachers and pupils and amongst teachers and pupils, encouraged by positive interethnic interactions, including the close involvement of the local community (Banks, 1981, 1982, 1984). Empirical work from both sides of the Atlantic (HMI, 1977; Rutter et al, 1979; Kyle, 1985), supports quite clearly the importance of school ethos and the need for such a whole-institution approach (Items 10 - 18).

Whilst I am not proposing that such tentative principles as I have listed above represent as yet a fully developed middle range theory, or series of middle range theories, they do represent a limited set of assumptions and presumptions from which specific principles of professional action may be derived and subjected to confirmation by empirical investigation, and from which valid generalizations may be made in a logically consistent way. We are, in other words, already in a position to construct an interrelated series of provisional middle-range theories, which could effectively guide the implementation of teaching/learning strategies to correct for prejudice, the evaluation of those strategies and their consequent empirical verification and improvement. So the benchmatks for effective educational action and the schools addressing the goal of prejudice reduction are available, if only we would have regard to them and stop trying to re-invent the wheel with stone-age tools. The principles, identified above, could be further refined and added to by taking account of some of the more speculative and less thoroughly grounded work. From the series of BBC programmes focussed on the issues of multicultural education, issues concerned with staff development lead us to realise that any strategy for the introduction of prejudice reduction teaching must have at their core an effective staff development strategy, starting where the teachers 'are now', with their current attitudes and knowledge and with their current professional behaviour and professional criteria, including sensitive exploration of the phenomenon of institutional racism and pupils' and teachers' feelings and experiences of it.

When such principles are seen in the context of research and writing in the broader field of prejudice acquisition and reduction the possibilities for theory-building become clearer. There are, for example, four domains of research and writing

overlapping, but emphasising respectively, personality, social structure, culture and environment. These four explanatory domains have leapfrogged each other in their development over the past fifty years and it is probably the case that any satisfactory middle range theory will have to take into account all of them. Unfortunately, I do not have the space in this brief paper to discuss the four domains and I must refer you elsewhere for further details (Lynch, 1987a). Suffice to say that prejudice reduction is "a deliberate and systematic process, which aims, by means of coherent and sustained educational and broader social strategies, policies and practices, to enable individuals and groups to re-orient their beliefs and behaviour, in such a way that their predispositions to negatively discriminate are attenuated or eradicated. It is an essentially moral, rational and educational process, carried out according to principles appropriate to the values of a democratic society, and it eschews co-ercion and indoctrination" (Lynch, 1987a).

It is quite possible for a person who is not prejudiced to be a discriminator. The circumambient values of the institution or society may exercise an influence which produces in the non-prejudiced, well-intentioned person false stereotypes, or even on occasions merely silence, either of which may enhance and facilitate their perpetration of discrimination on the basis of race, sex, class or creed. It is therefore important for strategies of prejudice reduction to bear in mind these major dimensions of major prejudice: individual, structural, cultural, and environmental; and to incorporate this insight into the design of pedagogical initiatives to correct for prejudice.

Turning now to some of the change strategies of which we have details, and which may provide nodal points for the development of more overarching approaches to the eradication of prejudice, we are faced with a wide variety of disparate, unconnected and non-continuous approaches, including such initiatives as the matching of change strategies and pedagogical principles, strategies aimed at the pre-school level, teaching through drama, attempts at change by discourse, role-playing and simulation exercises, the production of materials and packs, the encouragement of teachers to study their own practice and expand the criteria for the judgement of their own professional actions and practices, and attempts to introduce multicultural education to correct for prejudice by predominantly cognitive means, both in schools and in teacher education. Gay (1982) cautions, that education needs to aim at higher levels of intellectual functioning and social and moral perspective-taking, for there is evidence that those who achieve these higher levels are less likely to be involved in prejudiced social behaviour.

Whilst a number of academics have attempted to draw maps of these initiatives, we have as yet no complete 'cartographical' survey of the initiatives which have been taking place so far, let alone systematic and scientific theories for prejudice reduction. We do, however, have overviews of the literature and evaluations of some of the teaching techniques. I have identified and summarised elsewhere (Lynch, 1987a), some of the core literature on prejudice reduction in schools and proposed twelve major teaching approaches, out of which teachers may construct their own integrated teaching strategy. These twelve approaches include direct teaching, principle-testing and values education, interethnic contact, drama and simulation, moral education, case-studies, co-operative group-work, coaching, discourse, coalition-formation, materials approaches and awareness training. In each case, I have looked at the evidence for the efficacy of the particular approach, its weaknesses and its interdependence with the other approaches and with the overall democratic classroom ethos and school climate. I have argued that integration of the different approaches into the personal teaching style of the educator may be expected to lead to cognitive, affective and behavioural gains, higher self esteem for all pupils, an increased sense of personal efficacy, lower levels of prejudice and learning anxiety as well as improved academic performance and intellectual attainment.

If I am correct in my interpretation of the available evidence, then we already have available to us the means, whereby teachers and schools may address successfully the task of prejudice reduction. What is lacking is the political will and the theoretical underpinning. Moreover, the interesting thing about these educational strategies and teaching/learning approaches is the large measure of overlap which they enjoy with the characteristic components of effective schools, according to research on both sides of the Atlantic (Kyle, 1985; United States Department of Education, 1986; HMI, 1977; Rutter, 1979). Culmatively, the force of such research and writing is sufficient to persuade us that a school can develop a good ethos, serving both intellectual and social dimensions of its work and that each facet of the ethos will support each other: academic and intellectual achievement and improved social relations and attitudes. Academic attainment does not have to take a 'backseat' to improved social relations and attitudes (Crain et al, 1982; Slavin, et al, 1985), for prejudice reduction can give a 'double bonus' in school and classroom provided that it is organised according to specific principles. What those principles are emerges clearly in the case of some teaching/learning strategies; less clearly in the case of others, but more eloquently than ignorance in the case of all. We already have a number of interconnected middle-range assumptions on which prejudice reduction may be based with regard to such approaches as interethnic contact (Allport, 1954), co-operative group work (Johnson et al, 1981; Sharan, 1985), moral education (Kohlberg, 1984), principle testing (Kehoe, 1984a, 1984b, 1984c), coaching and expectation training

(Stephan, 1985; Cohen et al, 1976), intergroup contact and behaviour (Tajfel, so why not use them?

The upshot of this brief excursion towards middle-range theories for prejudice reduction is, at the moment, a series of tentative and provisional 'Ptolomy-charts' identifying possible guiding principles for the establishment of policies of multicultural education by teachers in schools and pathways to more sophisticated middle-range theories to support pedagogical approaches for teachers in schools. There is much work still to be done, but I would summarise the major principles which derive from this brief paper as the following:

1. Direct teaching to correct for negative racial attitudes can result in positive gains;
2. Strategies compatible with the context and skills of teachers who are involved are more likely to be successful;
3. The value of 'openmindedness' is likely to transfer from the discussion of one controversial issue into another;
4. The results of such gains are likely to be non-persistent without reinforcement;
5. Where the teaching/learning strategies include an appeal to the judgement of participants, they may, in some cases, result in regression in an undesired direction;
6. In the face of racism, there is a need for collegiality of decision and action;
7. Only as part of broader social policies and interests, is it likely that tackling prejudice in the school will be successful;
8. Educational strategies for prejudice reduction must include teaching for cognitive gains, for example to correct for misinformation as well as affective and behavioural objectives;
9. A democratic classroom and school ethos are essential for maximum effectiveness;
10. The strategies must be holistic, comprehensive in scope and sequence, and include the total school environment;
11. There must be a permeation of the purposes, values and attitudes of multiculturalism into every facet of the school's functioning;
12. The principles involved will encompass and embrace mutual and multiple acculturation of pupil and teacher by each other in a process of cultural reciprocity;
13. Approaches must include positive multiethnic interactions with significant

others;

14. The staff composition must reflect ethnic pluralism;

15. Learning styles must take account of the ethnic pluralism of the school;

16. Continuous efforts are needed, including systematic reinforcement;

17. Teaching/learning approaches need to address both decision-making and social-actioning competencies;

18. The curriculum must aim to strengthen the intercultural competence of the pupils;

19. Maximum use needs to be made of the resources and skills of the local community;

20. The holistic strategy must include particular attention to assessment and evaluation.

References

Allport, G.W. (1954) The Nature of Prejudice. New York: Addison Wesley.

Aronowitz, S. and Giroux, H.A. (1985a) "Radical Education and Transformative Intellectuals", in Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory, 99:3, pp. 48-63.

Aronowitz, S. and Giroux, H.A. (1985b) Education Under Siege. South Hadley, Mass: Bergin and Harvey Inc.

Banks, J.A. (1987) Multiethnic Education: Theory and Practice. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Banks, J.A. (1982) 'Reducing Prejudice in Students: Theory, Research and Strategies'. A paper presented at the Kamloops Spring Institute for Teacher Education, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, February 3.

Banks, J.A. (1987) Teaching Strategies For Ethnic Studies. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bethlehem, D.W. (1985) A Social Psychology of Prejudice. London: Croom Helm.

Cohen, E.G., Lockheed, M.E. and Lohman, M.R. (1976) "The Centre for Interracial Co-operation: A Field Experiment", Sociology of Education, 49: pp. 47-58.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1983) Multicultural Classrooms. London: Croom Helm.

Crain, R., Mahard, R. and Narat, R. (1982) Making Desegregation Work. Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger.

Gay, G. (1982) 'developmental Prerequisites for Multicultural Education in the Social Studies', in Rosenzweig, L.W. (ed.), Developmental Perspectives in the Social Studies. Washington DC: National Council for the Social Studies, (Bulletin 66), pp. 67-81.

Grant, C.A. and Sleeter, C.E. (1987) "Race, Class and Gender: An Argument for Integrative Analysis", Review of Educational Research, 56.

Jeffcoate, R. (1979) Positive Image: Towards a Multicultural Curriculum. London: Writers and Readers Co-operative.

Jeffcoate, R. (1984) Ethnic Minorities and Education. London: Harper and Row.

Kehoe, J.E. (1984a) A Handbook for Enhancing the Multicultural Climate of the School. Vancouver, BC* University of British Columbia.

Kehoe, J.W. (1984b) Multicultural Canada: Consideration for Schools Teachers and Curriculum. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia.

Kehoe, J.W. (1984c) Achieving Cultural Diversity in Canadian Schools. Cornwall, Ontario: Vesta Publications.

Kohlberg, L. (1984) Essays on Moral Development. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Kyle, R.A. (1985) Reaching for Excellence: An Effective School Handbook. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office.

Lynch, J. (1983) The Multicultural Curriculum. London: Batsford.

Lynch, J. (1985) "Human Rights, Racism and the Multicultural Curriculum", Educational Review, Summer.

Lynch, J. (1986) Multicultural Education: Principles and Practice. London: Routledge.

Lynch, J. (1987a) Prejudice Reduction and the Schools. London: Cassell; New York: Nichols Publishing Co.

Lynch, J. (1987b) "Changing Attitudes: Prejudice and the Schools", in T.S. Chivers (ed,) Race and Culture in Education. Windsor, Berkshire: NFER-Nelson, pp. 61-77.

Milner, D. (1983) Children and Race Ten Years On. London: Ward Lock Educational.

Mortimore, P. et al.(1988) School Matters.(The Junior Years). Wells, Somerset: Open Books

Rutter, M. et al (1979) Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children. London: Open Books.

Sharan, S. et al. (1985) "Co-operative Learning Effects on Ethnic Relations in Israeli Junior High School Classrooms", in Slavin, R.E. et al., Learning to Co-operate: Co-operating to Learn. New York: Plenum Press.

Slavin, R.E. et al. (1985) Learning to Co-operate: Co-operating to Learn. New York: Plenum Press.

Stenhouse L. et al. (1982) Teaching About Race Relations: Problems and Effects. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Stephan, W.G. (1985) "Intergroup Relations", in Lindzey, G. and Aronson, E. (eds.) The Handbook of Social Psychology. New York: Random House.

Tajfel, H. (1981) "Social Stereotypes and Social Groups", in Turner, J. and Giles, H. (eds.) Intergroup Behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Troyna, B. and Ball, W. (1985) Views from the Chalkface: School Responses to an LEAs Policy on Multiracial Education. Coventry: University of Warwick.

Troyna, B. (ed.) (1987) Racial Inequality in Education. London: Tavistock.

Twitchin, J. and Demuth, S. (1985) Multicultural Education. London: BBC.

United States Department of Education (1986) What Works: Research about Teaching and Learning. Washington DC: US Department of Education.

Walkling, P. (1980) "The Idea of a Multicultural Curriculum", Journal of Philosophy, 14:1, pp. 87-95.

NP Advance Book Information....

Nichols Publishing Company

SELECTED BY CHOICE AS AN OUTSTANDING ACADEMIC BOOK OF 1987/8

TITLE: PREJUDICE REDUCTION AND THE SCHOOLS

AUTHOR/EDITOR: Professor James Lynch

PRICE AND BINDING: $16.50 Paperback

SIZE: 208pp.

ISBN: 0-89397-283-5

PUBLICATION DATE: September 1987

DESCRIPTION This book fills the gap in the literature available to educators and students who are seeking to respond to the cultural diversity affecting their teaching lives. It is a major text which directly addresses the way in which teachers and schools may contribute to the reduction, and if possible, the elimination of prejudice.

Prejudiced attitudes are a by-product of the diversity of the socialization processes which children experience in a multicultural society. The author suggests that schools have a particular responsibility as well as a unique opportunity to educate pupils out of their unhealthy and anti-social values and behaviour.

The author draws on the international literature available from a variety of inter-disciplinary perspectives to build principles for professional practice. This book will assist schools and teachers in attacking one of the most tenacious and central problems facing society.

The volume covers such topics as moral education; values education; principle-testing; intergroup relations; ethnicity; effective schooling and education for prejudice reduction. The text includes: highlighted definitions; chapter summaries and reader activities; listings of all guiding principles for educators; diagrams and checklists; together with an extensive bibliography and name and subject indexes. This is the only major contemporary text available which draws on such a wide range of international traditions to address the needs and responsibilities of teachers and schools in combating prejudice.

CONTENTS Introduction. 1. Democratic values and discrimination. 2. Multicultural education and teaching for prejudice reduction. 3. Prejudice acquisition and reduction. 4. Whole school policies for combating prejudice. 5. A curriculum strategy for prejudice reduction. 6. Teaching approaches. 7. Resources for teaching to reduce prejudice. 8. Staff development strategies. 9. Postscript. Subject/Name Indexes.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR Professor Lynch is the Dean of the Faculty of Education at Sunderland Polytechnic in England. He wrote this book while a visiting Professor at the University of Washington in Seattle.

Scholarly Discount

Correspondence Address:
P.O. Box 96
New York, New York 10024

Street Address:
155 West 72nd Street
New York, New York 10023

(212) 580-8079

Nichols Publishing is the trade name of W.G. Nichols, Inc.